

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Stupidity or Madness?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE BROCK

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the collapse of the recent summit meeting and the events preceding and subsequent thereto have been distressing to all of us, the Members of Congress, the executive branch, and the American public.

Time and history alone will eventually relate the circumstances, the fault, or the blame, if such can be properly characterized, for the incidents which the Soviet Union so conveniently utilized to disperse the scheduled talks dwelling upon peace in the troubled world, dispelling the cold war and lowering the Iron Curtain.

In all this history of international relations, and particularly those involving the very personages of the heads of government, has there been such abuse and vilification heaped upon the head of a sovereign people, as has occurred in the series of irresponsible, vitriolic, and extremely vulgar utterances by Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union.

While we, as officials of this Government, and the citizens of this great Republic have the constitutional right to our thoughts and expressions, if you will, as to the rights or wrongs leading to the summit collapse, we should meditate very seriously on the immediate tensions that have arisen out of this situation. Further, this is the time that, "we, the people," should unite and stand fast in support of our Chief Executive and our Government until these tensions subside and the vitriolic and polluted air is cleared.

We should bear in mind that right or wrong, he is our President and this is our Government. United, we stand but divided, we shall fall.

Mr. Speaker, I would call to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues in this House the purpose of an editorial published on June 6 in the *Norfolk Daily News, Norfolk, Nebr.*, a progressive daily with an enterprising editorial staff.

The editorial, entitled "Stupidity or Madness?" is an excellent treatise on the summit and postsummit actions and utterances of one Nikita Khrushchev. It is a courageous piece of writing, one that endeavors to reflect our national thinking on the ultimate results therefrom.

May I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, and with the consent of my colleagues in the House, include these portions of a fine editorial in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, where it may be available for all to read and give sober reflection to the threat about us.

The article, in part, reads:

The world, or, at least, that decent portion of it which still believes in manners and

morals, was gagged by his vitriolic attack on President Eisenhower at Paris following the collapse of the summit meetings. But his freeloader repeat performance in Moscow the other day was even worse.

Khrushchev has been so arrogant and ill mannered against the man whose efforts for peace have given the world its great hope that he no longer can be regarded as a responsible leader of a major nation.

The world hasn't seen such a disgusting display of irresponsibility since Adolf Hitler was spouting curses at all who stood in the way of his designs for world conquest.

Immediate war was Hitler's aim. We cannot believe that Khrushchev really wants war. The only conclusion to be drawn is that we are watching the spectacle of a world leader roaring into the winds, cloaked in a mantle of stupidity and madness.

President Eisenhower Thanks Democratic Congressmen for Their Assurance of Support of Mutual Security Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, today is a day of great importance to the security of the United States and the defense of the free world, for we are to begin debate on the bill providing appropriations for the mutual security program.

Mr. Speaker, I was glad to be one of a group of Democratic Members of Congress who on May 25, 1960, wrote a letter to President Eisenhower assuring him that, in spite of criticisms we felt with respect to the handling by his administration of the foreign policy of our country, we would oppose any unwise cuts in the mutual security appropriations bill.

We told the President of our pride in the support which the Democratic Party has given to the Marshall plan, the Truman doctrine, point 4 and the mutual security program. We concluded:

We wish to reaffirm the policy of the Democratic Party in past years of resisting the encroachment of communism and stimulating the advance of democracy in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include at this point the text of the letter to President Eisenhower to which I have referred:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 25, 1960.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the undersigned Democratic Members of Congress, are writing to you concerning the mutual security appropriations bill shortly to be considered by the House of Representatives.

We take note of the letters many of us have received from your Deputy Assistant expressing your gratification and appreciation for our support of the mutual security authorization bill. We take note as well of the action of the Vice President in urging Republican Members of the House Appropriations Committee to resist massive reductions in this program.

We have for the past 7 years been critical of the handling by your administration of the foreign policy of our country and in recent days we have been deeply distressed by the conduct of our affairs before the summit meeting. Indeed, some of us have just written to you a series of questions concerning the collapse of the summit conference.

We nonetheless believe the mutual security program an indispensable part of our foreign policy and we wish to advise you that we shall oppose any unwise cuts in the mutual security appropriations bill.

We are proud of the support which the Democratic Party has given to the Marshall plan, the Truman doctrine, point 4 and the mutual security program. We wish to reaffirm the policy of the Democratic Party in past years of resisting the encroachment of communism and stimulating the advance of democracy in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

Respectfully,
CHET HOLIFIELD, 19th District, California; CHESTER BOWLES, Second District, Connecticut; STEWART L. UDALL, Second District, Arizona; JAMES ROOSEVELT, 26th District, California; CLEMENT W. MILLER, First District, California; CHARLES O. PORTER, Fourth District, Oregon; HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, 11th District, New Jersey; MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, 17th District, Michigan; EMANUEL CELLER, 11th District, New York; GEORGE A. KASEM, 25th District, California; CHARLES C. BIGGS, JR., 13th District, Michigan; ROBERT N. GIAMMO, Third District, Connecticut; THOMAS J. LANE, Seventh District Massachusetts; LEONARD G. WOLF, Second District, Iowa; LEE METCALF, First District, Montana; FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Fourth District, New Jersey; JOHN BRADEMAS, Third District, Indiana; EDITH GREEN, Third District, Oregon; JEFFREY COHELAN, Seventh District, California; JOSEPH KARTH, Fourth District, Minnesota; JOHN A. BLATNIK, Eighth District, Minnesota; LEONARD FARSTEIN, 19th District, New York; HERMAN TOLL, Sixth District, Pennsylvania; RALPH J. RIVERS, At Large, Alaska; JAMES G. O'HARA, Seventh District, Michigan; JOHN R. FOLEY, Sixth District, Maryland; EUGENE J. KEOGH, Ninth District, New York; WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., Fifth District, Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. FRIEDEL, of Maryland, also asked to be associated with the letter.

Under date of May 31, 1960, I received, as the signatory of the May 25 letter on behalf of my colleagues, a letter from President Eisenhower expressing his appreciation for our assurances of support for this program.

Said President Eisenhower, "It is gratifying to me, and reassuring, that we are in full accord in respect to this activity so basic to our security and the future of freedom everywhere."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include at this point in the *RECORD*

President Eisenhower's letter of May 31, 1960:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 31, 1960.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAs: I hope you will advise the cosigners of your May 25 letter of my appreciation of their assurance, and of yours, that your group will steadfastly support adequate funds for the mutual security program. Of course I am aware that we may differ on certain aspects of the Nation's affairs, but it is gratifying to me, and reassuring, that we are in full accord in respect to this activity so basic to our security and the future of freedom everywhere.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT EISENHOWER.

REPUBLICAN EX-CONGRESSMAN STRONG ON
WORDS, WEAK ON DEEDS

And, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to make a personal reference, as I listen to some of the criticism directed at me by my Republican predecessors in Congress because I am among those Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle interested in having more facts about the U-2 incident—as I listen to some of my Republican predecessor's criticisms, I am constrained to point out that the voice of the demagog is once more heard in the land.

For the Republican ex-Congressman who seeks to cover with a blanket of silence an honest and essential discussion of foreign policy events that may deeply affect the security of our country is very strong on words but very weak on deeds in the support of freedom against the menace of communism.

REPUBLICAN EX-CONGRESSMAN VOTES
AGAINST EISENHOWER PROGRAM

For, Mr. Speaker, the Republican ex-Congressman to whom I refer on May 14, 1958, voted for the mutual security authorization bill but on July 2, 1958, turned right around to vote against the mutual security appropriation bill. This Republican ex-Congressman thus cast his vote against a program which President Eisenhower has repeatedly insisted is essential to the defense of the free world against the forces of communism.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for the mutual security authorization bill and I shall vote for the mutual security appropriations bill as well. The times are too dangerous to be able to afford the doubletalk of voting for the first and against the second.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert at this point the text of a letter to me dated May 17, 1960, from Bryce N. Harlow, deputy assistant to the President, concerning my vote in support of the mutual security authorization bill:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 17, 1960.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAs: On Saturday last, as he completed preparations for the summit conference in Paris, President Eisenhower requested me to send to you, in his behalf, this note of gratification and appreciation for your support of the mutual security authorization bill. He stressed once again his profound conviction that this program

is indispensable to our own and free world defense against Communist imperialism, and indispensable also in encouraging struggling millions in less fortunate nations in their effort to live their lives in freedom. It is a program requiring, he said, unreserved support by all of our informed citizens and officials, and he feels it would be the height of folly to allow isolated administrative shortcomings and disappointments, or local considerations, political or otherwise, to tempt anyone to jettison or cripple the entire undertaking.

Especially the President voiced this hope, and asked that it be communicated to you in his behalf: that your responsible act of support for the mutual security authorization be matched by a determined resistance to any effort to effect massive reductions in the mutual security appropriations soon to be considered by the House. Massive reductions, he pointed out, can be accomplished only by undermining our own security, free world security, and the cause of human freedom everywhere in the world.

The President asked me to explain that he would have advised you himself of these views had his time permitted before leaving for Paris.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

BRYCE N. HARLOW,
Deputy Assistant to the President.

Mr. Speaker, I hope very much that we Democrats will support adequate funds for the mutual security program. It is in the interest of our country and of the cause of human freedom that we do so.

"Genocide Day" for Baltic Peoples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the understanding of current world problems is facilitated by placing them in a historical sequence since the events of the past, when duly documented, are a great aid to us in the consideration of current problems and plans for the future.

Today, June 14, sadly and with a sense of frustration, we make note of what is historically described as Genocide Day. In June 1941 the forces of the Soviet Union conducted mass deportations of Latvians, Lithuanians, and Estonians to central Russia from which area very few ever returned to their homeland. The purpose of these deportations was to complete the consolidation of control of the Communists over these previously independent Baltic peoples. Each of the three Baltic States, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, had a long history of nationalistic opposition to Russian control, inspired, in a great part, by the religious structures of the countries which provided the people additional strength and the will to resist. In the previous period from 1918 to 1940, they made remarkable strides in developing as free nations.

Mr. Speaker, we, in these days of renewed international tensions should reiterate our solemn promise to these brave peoples that the conduct of our foreign

policy pledges us to work so that they may eventually regain their freedom from the present oppressive Communist slave regime.

Million Filipinos Greet President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, relevant to the visit of the President to the Far East including the Philippines, there appeared a leading editorial in the Journal of Commerce of New York in its issue of Tuesday, June 7, 1960. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith this timely editorial:

A PARTICULAR IMPORTANCE

In a letter to Senator WALLACE BENNETT, Republican, of Utah, last week, President Eisenhower said he attaches "particular interest" to congressional enactment of a 4-year extension to the Sugar Act together with flexible authority for the President to change U.S. quotas for foreign producers.

We should think he would attach particular importance to it. We should think Congress would, too, including the House Agriculture Committee, which just voted a simple 1-year extension of the act, and the Rules Committee, which is now considering what priority, if any, the subject should be given on the floor.

For as matters stand today, what the Agriculture Committee has done has been to vote a handsome dividend for Mr. Fidel Castro, that well-known exponent of the democratic way of life in Cuba, while threatening to deprive the President of something that could prove very valuable to him and to American foreign policy generally in the course of his forthcoming visit to the Philippines and the Far East.

As the law stands today, and as it would stand until the end of 1961 under the 1-year extension of the Sugar Act approved by the Agriculture Committee, whenever any domestic sugar-producing area cannot fill its assigned quota, the Secretary of Agriculture must award a substantial proportion of the shortfall to Cuba.

And right now it looks as though Puerto Rican output will fall short of its quota by 300,000 tons and the Hawaiian crop by 200,000 tons.

So the prospect is that unless Congress as a whole overturns this ill-advised move on the part of the House Agriculture Committee, Dr. Castro's regime will automatically get a bonus of 160,000 tons as a reward for his confiscatory attacks on American business and for his incessant vilification of the United States and its institutions. This assumes, of course, that Cuba could actually supply that much, which is very doubtful.

As we previously remarked in discussing this subject, if anyone has ever demonstrated the need for an extensive overhaul of U.S. legislation on sugar quotas, it is Dr. Castro. It is ridiculous that U.S. controls should be so rigidly fixed that they cannot be adapted to changing circumstances in general, and to deal with as consistently bad an actor as Castro in particular.

But the shortcomings in the present Sugar Act were evident long before the present Cuban regime shot its way into power.

President Eisenhower himself called attention to some of these when in signing the present act 4 years ago, he said explicitly that in any further extensions of the act, provision ought to be made to permit the Philippines to enjoy the same proportionate share of increasing American consumption as is enjoyed by other countries.

Not only is the present system too rigid, but its rigidity is fixed in such a way that it discriminates painfully against a country whose steady friendship and cooperation is of the utmost importance to the United States.

It would be one thing to be caught in a situation in which a rigid system of controls permitted no change to be made for a period of years, as might be the case if, say, the Sugar Act had 2 or 3 years to run.

But it is quite another to find the way open to such a change, and then fail to make it. The way is now open, for the 1956 Sugar Act (which was of 4 years' duration) expires at the end of this year, so Congress must deal with it in one way or another during 1960 or the whole quota system will collapse.

But here we face a peculiar situation. Congress has ordered the administration to stop all foreign aid to Cuba—an action we thought and still think unwise because we believe the administration should have more discretion in such matters. Now, the House Agriculture Committee, and some other legislative circles, seem bent on refusing the President the discretionary powers he needs to cut down on the quota bonuses that would automatically go to Cuba under the existing law. Moreover, he is still frustrated in his efforts to achieve a better break for the Philippines, which certainly deserve one.

It certainly doesn't make sense, unless it is expressed in terms of a conviction that Congress is better-equipped than the President to handle the day-to-day twists in our foreign relations, economic as well as political, a conviction from which we heartily dissent.

We very much hope that more responsible quarters in the Senate and House will grasp that "particular importance" of passing a sensible 4-year sugar bill, and of doing so before the President sets off for the Philippines.

On Sunday, June 12, the New York Times carried two articles datelined Havana entitled "Reds Stepping Up Missions to Cuba" and "American Hotels Seized in Havana."

How much more of the Castro regime can the American people stand?

On the other hand, we were told a few days ago by Secretary of State Herter who spoke before the SEATO Council, that further Communist activity in the Far East is likely as an aftermath of the failure of talks at the summit. We have our firm friend and ally, the Republic of the Philippines, with 600 million Chinese Reds breathing down the back of her neck. It is time, Mr. Speaker, that we had a reevaluation of the world situation with respect to the United States and the millions of our friends in the Far East, especially the Republic of the Philippines.

Philippine-American relations have rather been subjected to a rough beating. Long unresolved problems between the two countries have generated irritants which in turn have developed into big thorns in the side of Philippine-United States friendship. Most of these irritants are caused by misunderstandings. President Eisenhower can do much to dispel these misunderstandings.

As a matter of fact, in the statement made by President Eisenhower as his reasons for the trip he stated and I quote:

I am going to these countries: Because with the Republic of the Philippines we have the closest ties of association beginning six decades ago, and because it was in the Philippines many years ago that we launched our first major program to help a developing people achieve a prosperous independence.

PHILIPPINE SUGAR

Every American is aware of the sacrifices of our friend and ally, the Republic of the Philippines made during World War II. The sacrifices of the Philippine sugar industry because of its experience during World War II is even more pronounced when you consider that sugar lands and processing factories were devastated and destroyed. Recovery and rehabilitation were slow because of the shortage of machinery and the lack of cane seeds, work animals, and agricultural implements. It actually consumed more than the proverbial 7 lean years by Philippine sugar producers to attain their prewar position. In the period from 1941-53, the Philippines shipped to the United States only 4,433,501 short tons out of what would have been their share of 12,376,000 short tons. Other foreign sources, principally Cuba, supplied the difference of almost 8 million tons lost by the Philippine sugar interests through no fault of their own. The facility with which U.S. sugar users were able to obtain the sugar supply curtailed by the war in the Far East is commendable and has been recognized and rewarded. The Philippine sugar industry by the same token should not be deprived of its opportunity to come back to some extent through sharing with other foreign suppliers the increased demand in U.S. sugar consumption.

During 8 years after the liberation of the Philippines, sugar lost its preeminent position as a Philippine export product and ranked second to copra in importance. Today, however, the sugar industry is again on its prewar productive capacity and from now on will provide the country with a source of dollar income of \$100 million annually. Moreover, the industry is a major source of revenue to the Philippine Government. According to recent estimates 25 percent of its total receipts is derived from the sugar industry.

Among all foreign suppliers no other country occupies the position of the Republic of the Philippines in its relationship with the United States and no fair analogy might be drawn between United States-Philippine relations and other international connections and loyalties. For more than 50 years the Philippines to all intents and purposes were a part of the United States and the continuing interest of the Government and citizens of the United States in promoting the welfare of the relatively new Government of the Philippines has been manifested in many generous gestures. To detach sugar legislation from a broad program of diplomatic, legislative, political, economic and social collaboration and cooperation, and to adopt standards based on such considerations as the payment

of duties, the assistance to other countries in exploitation of agricultural resources or in other respects on an arms length basis affords an anomaly in U.S. official and unofficial conduct.

At this point it may be well again to clarify what seems to be an impression, mistaken though it is, that the fixed Philippine quota of 980,000 tons annually cannot be increased due to the provisions of the Sugar Act and the trade agreement in force between our country and the Philippines. Article II of the Philippine Trade Agreement Revision Act of 1955 specifically provides:

The establishment herein of the limitation on the amounts of Philippine raw and refined sugar that may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, in the United States for consumption, shall be without prejudice to any increases which the Congress of the United States might allocate to the Philippines in the future.

There are many other strong economic and political reasons for including in any revisions which this Congress makes of the Sugar Act for the period commencing January 1, 1961, an increase in the Philippine quota commensurate with other foreign suppliers to meet the annual increased sugar needs of the United States. I shall not elaborate upon them, but point again only to the moral obligation which we have to act in this manner in fulfillment of the promise of the President of the United States reflected in the editorial which I have quoted to the effect that at this very time we would allow the Philippines to share in increased consumption.

Address by James C. Oliver Before the Ahepa Tristate Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 12, 1960, at the Ahepa Tristate Convention, Portland, Maine, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER], made a noteworthy address which I feel could give inspiration to all of us and which I deem a pleasure to include in this Record. The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, it is with a deep sense of humility that I speak here today before you, a distinguished assembly of American citizens of Greek-American extraction.

Yet, it is most appropriate that I, as an elected public official, holding office through the indulgence of a free electorate in one of the greatest, if not the greatest, of all assemblies of free men, the U.S. House of Representatives, should take advantage of this great privilege which you have accorded me to address you, the dedicated members of Ahepa.

For, as your freely elected Representative, here in this meeting assembled today, I take this opportunity to speak to you of liberty and freedom, as fought for and practiced by the ancestors of all of us. I, also, must avail

myself of this opportunity to warn you that the threat of loss of freedom hangs heavily over us and, in fact, over the entire world.

Today we face a common foe, not only in Greece and in America but in every section of the world, more ruthless, more cunning, more determined, more barbarously willing and eager to enslave mankind than were the Huns, the Slavs, the Persians, and all the other power-drunk conquerors of the ages.

The Soviets and the Red Chinese, ladies and gentlemen, have never changed their spots. These despoilers of freedom are dedicated to the conquest of peace-loving and freedom-worshipping peoples of the Western World. Their boast that they will bury us is no idle talk. This is no game which they are playing for mere marbles of gain. They are playing in deadly earnest and for keeps. We are fat, we are complacent, we are unwilling to listen to the hard facts and the harsh realities of the world in which we live today.

Your family ancestors in Greece for centuries faced up to the facts of life, as for example at Thermopylae and Salamis. A small and battered slab of marble discovered about a year ago in Troizen, just south of Athens, tells, through its inscription, of the battle orders issued by Themistocles when the Persians were on the march from Sardes, the seat of their government.

This slab and its inscription of fighting words has been described by its discoverer as the Athenian equivalent of our Declaration of Independence.

In truth, this battle order cut in marble backgrounds the crucial victory of the Greeks that followed at Salamis over the greatest empire of that period of history. It gave your ancestors command of the sea. It restored their freedom to pursue their ideals of liberty and made possible their golden age for which mankind has ever since gained the political and cultural inspiration which will never be extinguished.

So, my friends, we know from the past that we must fight for freedom and the heritage of liberty which, in fact, have been passed to us in this generation on a silver platter and which we are destined to lose if we fail to wake up to the threatening clouds which are becoming ever blacker, almost daily.

Then, again, as we refer in rather inadequate words to another episode in the glorious history of your great fatherland, we are once more inspired by the bravery and the indomitable courage of the Greek people and its leadership of the past.

It was 139 years ago when Archbishop Germanos of Patras raised the standard of revolt in his monastery at Kalavryta against the Turks on March 25, and his people joined him in this national struggle against their oppressors, his daring act ushered in a new day for the Greek people. That courageous deed by a stouthearted dignitary of the Greek Church marked a sharp break from the events of preceding centuries when Greeks were subjected successively to the Romans, the Frankish kings and the Turks. That day became the independence day of the Greeks.

We in this country have always held the Greeks in exceptionally high esteem. We have always had great sympathy for them, and have done our utmost to help them whenever we could. In their fight for freedom and independence against the tyranny of the Turks, and especially in their desperate struggle to maintain their independence against fascism, nazism, communism, and all forms of totalitarianism, they have counted upon our sympathy and on our aid. We are proud to say that fortunately we have been in a position to help them and have not disappointed them. And this has been true in the past as it is at present.

In the early days of the Greek war of independence a number of philhellenic groups

were formed in this country for the purpose of raising funds and thus extending material aid to the fighting Greeks. A wave of philhellenic enthusiasm swept over America. President Monroe himself was not immune to the contagion of this philhellenism. This is clearly shown in his annual message on December 3, 1822, when he gave some reasons for our interest in the Greek cause. "The mention of Greece," he said, "fills the mind with the most exalted sentiments and arouses in our bosoms the best feelings of which our nature is susceptible. Superior skill and refinement in the arts, heroic gallantry in action, disinterested patriotism, enthusiastic zeal and devotion in favor of public and personal liberty are associated with our recollections of ancient Greece. That such a country should have been overwhelmed and so long hidden, as it were, from the world under a gloomy despotism has been a cause of unceasing and deep regret for ages past. It was natural, therefore, that the reappearance of those people in their original character, contending in favor of their liberties, should produce that great excitement and sympathy in their favor which have been so signally displayed throughout the United States. A strong hope is entertained that these people will recover their independence and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth."

This was an eloquent and welcome explanation. As the elected head of the government of this country, he expressed the feeling of our people. No less eloquent was Daniel Webster, perhaps the most illustrious statesman-orator of his day, when he characterized the Greek War of Independence as part of a greater struggle between the absolute and the regulated governments. He stated that America could not and should not hold aloof from world affairs, and it was time for the people and the Government of this country to take a stand. "As one of the free states among the nations," he declared, "as a great and rapidly rising republic, it would be impossible for us, if we were not disposed, to prevent our principles, our sentiments, and our example from producing some effect upon the opinions and hopes of society throughout the civilized world." "Our side of this question," he added, referring to the Greek War of Independence, "is settled for us, even without our own volition. Our history, our situation, our character, necessarily decide our position and our course before we have even time to ask whether we have an option. Our place is on the side of free institutions."

There are many fine thoughts and noble ideals in these few sentences of that inimitable orator-statesman, but the core is found in the last sentence, for it reflects the full and free American spirit; our place is, and has always been, on the side of free institutions, erected and kept erect by free men. And the Greeks were among the forerunners of free men who founded free institutions and fought for their preservation.

Nor has our expression of sympathy and our show of kinship of ideas with the Greeks been limited to mere words and declarations. It is well known that whenever Greeks have been in trouble, in need of material aid, we have been generous in helping them. This has been particularly true at the end of the First World War, and, of course, more so during and since the end of the last war. Early in the course of that war, when Greece was overrun by the Axis forces, our wartime President, the late Franklin Roosevelt, declared confidently that Greece would be liberated and rewarded for her heroic fight on the side of democracies against the forces of barbarism and darkness. He certainly echoed the true and genuine sentiment of the people of this country when he said: "I am glad to have the opportunity to reassure my friends of Greek origin and Greek

birth everywhere that it is the desire of the American Government to help Greece to the utmost of its capabilities."

Our postwar role in Greek affairs, our aid to Greece, both financially and militarily, is rather widely known and I need not dwell upon them in detail. As soon as circumstances permitted, toward the end of the last war, we were more generous in aiding Greece than at any time in our history. In March 1947 when we were asked by the hard-pressed Greek Government for urgent emergency and military assistance, we felt that it was our duty to comply with this request. The then President Truman felt that it was our solemn responsibility to give all we could to save Greece from the tightening clutches of communism. In his message to Congress on March 12, the President declared: "I do not believe that the American people and the Congress wish to turn a deaf ear to the appeal of the Greek Government."

Here again the President was echoing the sincere wishes of our people. We could not turn a deaf ear to the appeal of the Greek Government, even though we had already expended more than \$500 million in the form of supplies, lend-lease aid, and under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Fortunately, we had some more expendable dollars, and we did not seem to mind to add close to \$3 billion worth of aid to the Greeks. Yes, the Greeks have deserved well of us. I am indeed glad to say that we were able and willing thus to pay at least a part of our intellectual debt which we all feel humanity owes to Greece and to the Greek genius.

In their enthusiasm for creative things of lasting value, the attainments and accomplishments of the Greeks remain unsurpassed and unequalled. In their fervent enthusiasm for liberty and democracy, they have struggled against great odds, have fought bravely and have guarded their democratic institutions tenaciously. For almost 2,000 years, from 146 B.C. to A.D. 1821, Greece was ruled by the Romans, the Frankish kings, and by the Ottoman Turks. From the Battle of Corinth in 146 B.C. when Greece was overrun by Roman legions to the Battle of Navarino in 1827 when the tyranny of the Ottoman Turks was finally brought to an end in Greece, Greeks lived under alien rule, but during those centuries their spirit of freedom was not extinguished; their dauntless will to fight never deserted them. And the best proof of that was the long, often despairing, and almost endless fight which they carried on for 8 years before they could attain their freedom and independence.

While we are discussing the Greek heritage to the civilization of the free world it would be most remiss of me to neglect a brief reference to the tragedy of Cyprus where the Greek majority have been frustrated for too long in their legitimate fight for this preponderantly Greek area. The gallant struggle, symbolized by the dedicated efforts of that great patriot, Archbishop Makarios, will eventually succeed and the ends of justice will be served. Of this, I feel certain.

Today, my friends of Ahepa, these memorable events of history inspire us to defend our freedom and liberty, eternally, against the impending and potential dangers of totalitarian tyrants.

I should speak, if time permitted, of the great contributions which have been made to America by those in your families who came to our shores and now comprise in every center of population in the United States the core of God-loving, law-abiding, public spirited citizenry, which has helped to make and will continue to help to keep America great.

I would speak, my friends, if time permitted of the cultural contributions which America has gained from the illustrious his-

tory of Greece and its people down through the centuries. For these America is profoundly grateful.

But the greatest contribution of all is the philosophy of the dignity of man and of the freedom of the individual. It is for these that freedom loving people all over the world must be the most grateful. It is for these priceless values that we must prepare to fight when threatened. It is for this heritage which our forefathers died to preserve that we will fight to defend against any and every enemy of human self-respect wherever and whenever he shows his ugly head and his rocket rattling belligerency.

In closing, ladies and gentlemen, my friends of Ahepa, may that day never come again when we shall be compelled to fight in defense of these greatest of all assets of mankind, freedom and liberty, but, if, God forbid, it does come then in the philosophy of the song of the Greek heroes of the ages, we shall find this to be our one and only reply:

I may have a rock for my pillow
And only the snow for my cover
But I will never serve as a slave!
Dig a grave for me
Large and deep,
That I may stand with my gun—
Ready to fight.

The Baltic Peoples and Their Tragic Fate in 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the modern history of the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians has been fraught with much tragedy relieved by occasional triumph. Centuries before World War I they had lost their independence and lived under foreign regimes.

The end of that war ushered in a new era for these peoples. All three regained and proclaimed their independence in 1919, established their own democratic governments. These governments were duly recognized by other countries and they became members of the world community of nations.

During the period of freedom which they enjoyed during the interwar years, they rebuilt their war-ravaged countries, and were perfectly content with their lot. Unfortunately, however, in the larger world of international politics and diplomacy they were not masters of their fate.

With the rise of totalitarian governments both in Germany and in Russia the Baltic peoples found themselves in a very precarious position. They succeeded in maintaining their independence until the outbreak of the last war, and then brute Soviet force became the arbiter of their fate.

As the friends of these peoples in the West became involved in the war, the Soviet Union felt free to deal with the Baltic peoples as its dictator wished—to occupy and annex these countries and enslave their inhabitants. This was done not only in a high-handed manner but by resorting to barbaric methods.

By early June 1940 these countries were occupied by the Red army and at about the middle of the month the Soviet authorities in these countries rounded up all those suspected of opposing communism, numbering hundreds of thousands, and exiled them to the distant corners of the Soviet Union. From that day to this, 20 years after that tragic event, we still do not exactly know the fate of these helpless and unfortunate people who were arrested, herded into freight cars and destined to incarceration, servitude, and even death in desolate parts of the Soviet Union.

Today it is possible that some of these people, who survived the terrible years in exile, have returned to their homeland, but it is more probable that most of them have died in exile and misery, far away from their beloved homeland.

In observing the 20th anniversary of that tragic event, the Soviet deportations of men, women, and children by the hundreds of thousands in 1940 from the Baltic States, we pray for the souls of these brave but helpless people.

Sound Debt Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, last week the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] took note of the recent Treasury offering to exchange up to \$5½ billion of new 4-year notes and 8-year bonds for outstanding securities maturing on November 15, 1961. The gentleman views this offering as a giveaway, inasmuch as the existing bonds are earning interest at 2½ percent, whereas the new notes and bonds will earn rates of 3¼ percent and 3½ percent, respectively.

The gentleman's predilection for perpetually low interest rates, which could only lead to disastrous inflation, are well known to us, and need not be repeated at this time. It is important that the record be set straight, however, and that the current Treasury operation be judged for exactly what it is—a sound and imaginative debt management transaction that will ease the task of the next administration and benefit the American people.

The facts are these. On November 15, 1961, \$11.2 billion of 2½-percent bonds come due, of which almost \$11 billion are held by public investors. This huge amount is the largest publicly held maturity now outstanding. The easiest course for Secretary of the Treasury Anderson to take would be to do nothing, but simply ignore the problem that will confront the Treasury in November 1961.

If the size of this maturity is not in some way reduced, the pressure on the Government securities market in November 1961 could be almost unbearable.

As anyone even vaguely familiar with the market mechanism knows, \$11 billion of securities is simply too much to refinance efficiently at one time. Any attempt to do so would shoot interest rates upward and could greatly disrupt the market. This could do serious damage to the cause of sound Government finance. It would not be responsible for Secretary Anderson to ignore this problem.

The gentleman from Texas implies that it is foolish to offer securities with higher interest rates for outstanding bonds with lower rates. He attempts to compare the situation with an individual who might voluntarily refinance a home mortgage or an automobile loan at a higher rate. But I am sure that all of us would agree that such an action, rather than being improvident, would be quite appropriate if the individual were confronted, as is the Treasury, with a huge amount of debt coming due all at once. Such an individual would be wise to arrange for refinancing some of the debt well in advance, even if he had to pay a little more in interest to do so. Moreover, there is no assurance at all that the Treasury will be paying more interest for this necessary debt extension than if it waited until November 1961 to meet the problem. In fact, the necessary rate of interest to refinance \$11 billion of securities at one time could be very high indeed.

There is another important reason for the Treasury offering. The refusal of the Congress to remove the 4½-percent interest rate ceiling has forced the Treasury to sit by while the outstanding marketable debt has grown shorter and shorter in maturity. Today, almost 80 percent matures within 5 years. This progressive shortening of the debt cannot be viewed with complacency; it is highly dangerous. It forces the Treasury to come into the market more frequently and for larger amounts, and it complicates the problems of avoiding inflation, because the shorter a security gets, the more like money it is.

Thus, the current offering is a sensible and well-designed attempt to stretch out some of this ever-shortening debt. The Treasury is offering a coupon rate of 3½ percent on the new 8-year bond. It is willing, as stated many times, to sell a reasonable amount of such bonds, and would have done so in the past year, but the 4½-percent ceiling has prevented such action.

The record should also be set straight on the net interest cost of this operation. The gentleman from Texas maintains that the extra interest payable between June 23, 1960, and November 15, 1961, to those holders who elect to exchange will come to \$130 million on the whole \$5.5 billion. The gentleman's arithmetic confuses me, because I come up with an additional cost, for that period alone, of about \$99 million. But this is not the significant figure, if we agree, as we should, that some debt extension at this time is imperative, lest our huge public debt grows ever shorter in maturity. The true net cost, then, must be judged in terms of what it would cost the Treasury today to obtain the debt extension beyond November 1961.

represented by the new 4-year notes and 5-year bonds. Assuming market conditions in November 1961 are as they are today, such securities would have to carry interest rates no less than $4\frac{1}{2}$ percent and $4\frac{3}{8}$ percent, respectively. On this basis, the net cost to the Treasury of achieving this valuable debt extension is less than \$25 million, a modest amount indeed in view of the good that will be achieved.

Finally, note should be made of the reference of the gentleman from Texas to this offering as a "big giveaway." If such were the case, we would expect current holders of the $2\frac{1}{2}$ -percent bonds to be clamoring to exchange for the new securities. But the New York Times noted the other morning—June 9—that, as the books opened yesterday, "dealers in Government securities continued to sense that the Treasury invitation would meet largely with indifference." This is hardly a picture of a gigantic giveaway.

Mr. Speaker, the man who occupies the position of Secretary of the Treasury in November 1961, regardless of party, will owe a large debt of gratitude to Secretary of the Treasury Anderson for his courage and imagination in making this current offering. Rather than criticizing this action, the Members of this body should rise up with a resounding vote of thanks.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, due to the insistence on the part of the Democratic Party leaders to ignore the taxpayers and suspend congressional work for purpose of their pre-convention activity, I would call the attention of the Members to a very important commemorative occasion which deserves our complete attention and support.

I hope that we can all put aside partisan feelings and cooperate in the observance of Captive Nations Week, July 17-23, to display to the world the concern of individual U.S. Congressmen for lack of freedom that exists in these unfortunate countries now engulfed behind the Iron Curtain.

I need not remind you of the tragic consequences of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements that drove these people into political slavery. Groups of dedicated American citizens who are concerned with the plight of people in Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Yugoslavia, East Germany, Ukraine, and other segments of the Russian Empire will be using that week to remind all Americans of the desire to maintain interest in these Iron Curtain countries and work effectively toward their eventual freedom.

Since freedom is such a precious thing, we who often take its blessings for granted could learn much observing and understanding the suffering of those who

have lost their freedom to the ruthless atheistic Communist regimes.

Captive Nations Week must be remembered by all of us. I appeal to you to give it your attention in the period between the national conventions.

Massachusetts 1960 Convention of Veterans of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part of my remarks as guest speaker at the department of Massachusetts 1960 convention held on June 11, 1960, at Springfield, Mass.:

Greetings, the Veterans of World War I, of the U.S.A., is less than 2 years old.

Even though the average age of our membership is in the sixties, we believe that our greatest period of growth is just ahead of us. In fact, there will be a few of our comrades left to remind the Nation of our service, and to our ideals, in the year 2000.

To those who say that our organization exists for one purpose only, I say that during the next 10 to 20 years we shall develop a full-bodied program to strengthen our national heritage, and to protect our freedom.

In line with this, we have taken steps toward the creation of a memorial to the veterans of World War I.

It is likely that it will be built in the vicinity of Washington, D.C., near the site of a famous Civil War battlefield. Its proximity to Arlington National Cemetery and other heroic shrines will emphasize the courage which unites all who have fought in defense of our liberties, through the generations.

This is a good beginning.

World War I had its special goals, that gave a new vision to our national purpose.

Under the farseeing leadership of President Wilson, we were in step with the future. Although the cause for which we fought and bled was betrayed by politics at home, and by conspiracies abroad, we know that we did not sacrifice in vain. The enemy of 1917-18 is the friend of today—and one of the allied powers of those days, seized by the new tyranny of communism—has become the oppressor that would conquer the world.

In this age of swift communications, and of missiles that leap across the oceans, the need becomes more imperative for a world organization to eliminate warfare. And when that time comes, the world can look back to Woodrow Wilson and to the men who fought to make the world safe for freedom.

Before we achieve that goal we shall have to overcome many dangers, and to learn new techniques for turning back the Communist challenge to our survival.

Around the clock, communism is waging war against us with economic and political, and psychological weapons.

And because of this invisible but unrelenting strategy, many of our people find it hard to comprehend that we are presently engaged in a war where we could suffer defeat and slavery without a shot being fired.

The zigs and zags of Communist policy are directed against the minds of the free world in order to confuse, disarm, and demoralize us for the Communist takeover.

We were shocked and dismayed when Khrushchev sabotaged the summit conference and insulted the President of the United States.

But we should have been prepared for any eventuality, including that one, and should have been ready with measures to counteract it.

Our great weakness is the belief that the Communists will respond to reason, when we should know by this time that they will exploit every sign of weakness or indecision on our part.

In the field of psychological warfare we sometimes help them without realizing it.

When Khrushchev wrecked the summit conference it was news—sensational news—but we did not have to play it up to the extent that we did. I noticed on one day that a highly respectable New York newspaper carried six separate stories on its front page, each one of them containing the name of Khrushchev in its headlines. This over-emphasis gave to the Communist dictator the recognition and the prestige that he does not deserve. In other words, he scored a propaganda victory, and this newspaper helped him to exploit it—by featuring him in six front-page stories.

This is but one example of how the Communists play upon your gullibility, and use us to further their own ends.

For several years I have been disturbed by our preoccupation with the defense. This is a negative frame of mind, that gives every advantage to the Communists. It betrays fear of initiative, and fear of mounting the counteroffensive to win the minds of men.

The Communists spend on brainwashing, \$2 a year for every person in the free world, while we spend only 2 cents for each person within the Communist orbit in an effort to reach them with the truth.

To expose the lies of Communist propaganda which so often hypnotize innocent people and then to advance the missionary work of freedom, we must enlarge and intensify our program not only to help the underdeveloped countries, but to nourish and strengthen the underdeveloped minds, in the West as well as in the East.

Remember how the Communists promoted the so-called Stockholm peace petition a few years ago and induced millions of well-meaning people in the free world to sign it? Under the cloak of the word "peace" which appeals to most of humanity, they sought to lull the free world into a sense of false security. Fortunately, more realistic minds saw through this clever maneuver, and were not fooled by it.

Although myself and a few other Congressmen vigorously protested against the invitation of the White House to have Khrushchev visit the United States, we opened the doors of our hospitality to him.

Many Americans deluded themselves with the hope that he would be impressed and softened by the evidence of our material prosperity. But in one of his tantrums at Los Angeles he threatened to "bury us," if we failed to appease him by concessions that would mean surrender on the installment plan.

Soviet diplomacy is not diplomacy in the accepted meaning of that term. It is a principal weapon among the many used by Soviet propaganda. "Every form of exchange between Communist and other countries, whether diplomatic, cultural, commercial or technical, is conceived and worked out with propaganda in mind." According to Suzanne Labin who wrote "The Unrelenting War," a study of the strategy and techniques of Communist propaganda and infiltration.

"All members of Soviet missions abroad are trained primarily to charm and hoodwink high political or financial circles in the countries they are to undermine."

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, aptly described the Communists as "masters of deceit."

But, in spite of these warnings, too many Americans are apathetic toward the danger.

The Congress is forcing the administration to strengthen our retaliatory power in order to discourage and prevent a massive surprise attack upon the free world.

But this is not enough.

Our one, dangerous, unprotected front is psychological, political.

On the battlefield of "the war of minds" it is folly to sit back and wait. We must advance toward definite goals and with firm purpose.

Earlier in my remarks, I mentioned the need of a well-rounded and positive program for the Veterans of World War I, of the U.S.A.

As we are the older veterans, we must assume the responsibility of leadership in order to make our country strong and to keep it vigilant.

But we also have needs of our own, and those needs have been neglected by the Federal Government. Our self-respect requires that we battle to overcome the benefits deficit that has discriminated against the veterans of 1917-18.

We shall attain equality with our fellow veterans of other wars only when we finally succeed in winning a service pension for all honorably discharged veterans of World War I.

The Trail of Hoover's Life an American Heritage—Speech at the Dedication of the Hoover Boy Scout Trail at West Branch, Iowa, Saturday, June 11, 1960, by Congressman Fred Schwengel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 11, I was privileged to be the principal speaker at the dedication of the Hoover Trail for the Boy Scouts of Iowa at Herbert Hoover's birthplace in West Branch, Iowa.

On this occasion it was only fitting that I pay tribute to the wonderful force for good which President Hoover has been, not only in the Boy Scout program, but in the lives of all Americans.

It is my feeling that Herbert Hoover is one of the greatest living Americans and the attributes which have marked his distinguished career provide guidelines for all of us in becoming better citizens and in dedicating ourselves in serving our fellow man.

With that thought in mind, I would like to bring my address to the attention of my colleagues and under leave to extend my remarks, ask that the speech appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE TRAIL OF HOOVER'S LIFE, AN AMERICAN HERITAGE

(Speech at the dedication of the Hoover Trail, June 11, 1960, by the Honorable Fred Schwengel)

This dedication of this Hoover Trail is a historic, meaningful event in the life of this Nation and it will prove to be a picturesque feature of your Boy Scout program.

The appeal of Iowa's countryside is strong, but the citizenship values that we can get from appropriate thoughts during this dedication can likewise be very important.

The combination of the life of Herbert Hoover, the Scout program, and the Iowa woodlands and countryside is a rare and beautiful combination that should give to us a special message of confidence in and hope for the future of America.

It is my desire that we may receive from this dedication a little of what the surroundings of West Branch gave to Herbert Hoover as a boy, and in turn what Herbert Hoover has given to America and the world. He has already testified to the early influence of this community on his life.

I invite you to explore with me for a few moments the trail that President Hoover took through life—a trail that began in this peaceful and charming community.

For centuries before the advent of Herbert Hoover, his ancestors had been Quaker pioneers. The American part of their story started in 1725—half a century before the Boston Tea Party. America was still the red man's country. White settlements, except for the outposts of fur traders and explorers, were scattered only along the Atlantic coast. Trails were important then—not only as routes to adventure, but as the routes of travel—there were no roads as we know them today.

It was in 1725, according to family tradition, that three small boys landed in Boston from a sailing vessel just in from England. Their father and mother had died during the hard 3-month voyage, and they were taken into religious, kindly, stern New England homes. Papers in their baggage showed their name to be Minthorn and the oldest of the three, William, was Herbert Hoover's great-great-great grandfather—his first ancestor to live in America.

Many trails were followed by the Minthorns and the Hoovers from the eastern seaboard into Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, Ohio, and eventually across the Mississippi to a spot they decided to call home. The little community in Iowa named West Branch grew quickly. It was not long before there appeared a Quaker meeting house, frame homes, stores, and a blacksmith shop. These were in the midst of some of the most fertile land in America.

West Branch and surrounding settlements never became a metropolis but it did grow into a pleasant, prosperous town and the good Quakers carried their faith into their relations with one another. They did not consider written agreements necessary to bind any business deed—an oral promise was all that was asked. And as the boy Herbert Hoover grew to manhood, his world held high the Quaker tradition of honesty.

The ability to stand and walk erect is the most distinguishing characteristic of man. The best books of travel have been largely views afoot. One gets only passing views and superficial knowledge from automobiles, planes, and trains. There is no other way to acquire a true love of nature or an intimate acquaintance with birds and flowers and rocks and trees. Trails are a necessary laboratory to the study of botany and biology.

The trail also has an intimate social side. It tends to develop comradeship and intimacy. One can walk 10 miles on a trail with less fatigue than would grow out of a 5-mile hike on the concrete.

The boyhood of Herbert Hoover in the atmosphere of West Branch of that time taught him to follow the trail, to stand erect, to dig deeply for the knowledge that lies alongside the path, to hold with high regard comradeship and respect for the dignity of his fellow man, and to let the trail yield beneath his feet as a source of relaxation and introspection.

A great deal of America has been lost to view. It is behind our fences, over our hills, down our old tangled trails. The broadening aspects of exploring, as the Scout well knows, the education to be had from nature at first-hand, the joy one gets from being in the open, all were a part of Herbert Hoover's youth. In later years President Hoover said of the Scout program, "I know of no other form of Americanization that so produces real Americans."

In 1927 in a speech to the Iowa Society in Washington, D.C., Mr. Hoover spoke of the old swimming hole near West Branch under the railroad bridge "which needs to be deepened" because it was "hard to keep from pounding the mud with your hands and feet when you shove off for the 30 feet of a cross-channel swim." He spoke of fishing with his friends in the creek for "sunfish, suckers, and catfish with a willow pole, a line of butcher's string, a cork salvaged from a rubbish heap, an angleworm and a 1-cent hook." He recalled in the wintertime "sliding down Cook's Hill in a homemade sled and thawing our young chilblains with ice water." He remembered the tasty wild strawberries and wild grapes to be had for the picking along the trail he followed; the skating in winter over the frozen swimming hole on a pair of heelplate skates and the collection of fragments of coral, agate, or other bright-colored stones from the ballast along the railroad tracks. Perhaps here is the introduction of Herbert Hoover, the mining engineer.

Apart from these outdoor pastimes and school attendance there was the quiet, gentle, home life, with its family Bible reading at the day's close. But you good people of West Branch know the detailed story of Herbert Hoover better than most.

Herbert Hoover followed the trail across America to Oregon when his parents died. He earned his way through Stanford University, graduating with a degree in geology and engineering. He was employed in mines in several Western States and then in Australia, and held numerous important mining jobs around the world.

It was when World War I broke out that Mr. Hoover's trail took him to Europe. Thousands of Americans were stranded in London. Herbert Hoover organized resources to help them back home, and then worked to send relief to the overrun population of Belgium and France. His success in this endeavor brought him wide fame and led to his appointment as U.S. Food Administrator in 1917. He was able to get cooperation from the United States and successfully supplied the Allied food demands. The war over, he headed the American Relief Administration and when that agency was liquidated he raised a private fund for the same purpose.

Ambassador Walter Hines Page wrote President Wilson when Hoover had completed the refugee job:

"Life is worth more, too, for knowing Hoover. . . . He's a simple, modest, energetic man who began his career in California and will end it in heaven; and he doesn't want anybody's thanks."

A Secretary of Commerce under both Harding and Coolidge, Hoover reorganized the Department and sought to maximize its usefulness to business. At the same time he organized several famine relief campaigns. Four years later, in 1928, he was the Republican nominee for President and won the election.

Many of the disturbing factors prevailing in 1929 were international in character while others were manifestations of domestic trends in particular countries. Basically, World War I had thrown the economic and financial organization of the entire world completely out of balance. It was difficult to maintain the balance of economic and financial equilibrium in the United States.

Before he took the oath of office as President, Mr. Hoover stated and I quote that he "conceived the Presidency more than an administrative office; it is a power for leadership bringing coordination of the forces of business and cultural life in every city, town, and countryside. The Presidency is more than executive responsibility. It is the symbol of America's high purpose. The President must represent the Nation's ideals and he must also represent them to the nations of the world."

After 4 years in the White House Herbert Hoover still regarded the Presidency "as a supreme obligation."

A basic tenet of his faith in the American way of life—a phrase which he is said to have originated—was "voluntary cooperation within the community." It included perfection of the social organization, care of those in distress, advancement of knowledge, scientific research, education, and the many phases of economic life.

"This," and I again quote President Hoover, "is self-government outside of government; it is the most powerful development of individual freedom and equal opportunity that has taken place in the century and one half since our fundamental institutions were founded."

Mr. Hoover believed in voluntary cooperation of all the people in all of the Nation's communities, along with a growing sense of individual responsibility, rather than an extension of government into our social and economic life which would find the correct "solution of many of our complex problems."

He once stated before a group of Young Republicans:

"While the inspiration to reform comes from the human heart, it is achieved only by the intellect. Enthusiastic hearts have flooded us with illusions. Ideals without illusions are good. Ideals with illusions are no good."

This advice is timeless, indeed, and we with the complexities of our age could really make something of this earth if we approached the solutions of our problems with high ideals and advanced programs with intelligence and enthusiasm.

Enthusiasm is an earmark of youth. It is an earmark of the Boy Scouts of America. As the Scouts of this area grow in stature to man's estate, it is my fond hope that they will study the life of Herbert Hoover so that they may become intimate with the trail that he has followed throughout his great and good life—a life he has shared with so many with completely unselfish motives.

Mr. Hoover has always been concerned with the kind and sort of men we place as leaders of America's youth. His stamp of approval would be placed upon those leaders who are sterling, clean, genuine—successful men, capable men, leaders in their own field—sympathetic and patient with boys. He has recognized that scouting is more than building a fire without a match along life's trail. That is only a part of the initiative needed to keep America strong.

During Herbert Hoover's term as President of the United States he was honorary president of the Boy Scouts of America. As you know, it is the custom of scouting to confer this honor and privilege upon the President of the United States. He is currently your honorary vice president. It is interesting, however, to glance over our shoulders today and recall a message from Honorary President Hoover which came from his heart in 1929—the first year of his Presidency. I quote as follows:

"I have gladly assumed the honorary presidency of the Boy Scouts of America because the first ideal of our democracy is that each individual shall have opportunity to take that position of leadership in the community to which his character, his ability, and his ambition entitled him; and because the progress of our country is thus directly related

to the training in leadership we can give to the youth of the Nation. In meeting the vital need that when the oncoming generation takes over our national affairs it shall be a generation bulwarked with character, the Boy Scout movement plays a most useful part. I wish all success to the boys themselves and to the scoutmasters who lead them, and I commend both to the unwearied support of the public that they so inspiringly serve."

The American Boy Scouts have done millions of good turns, from helping someone to cross the street to saving lives; but the greatest achievement is the millions of better men they have made, or are making of themselves by daily discipline and struggle toward an ideal. I refer especially to that quiet and determined discipline and struggle which Herbert Hoover learned so well from the trails he followed as a boy around West Branch.

Many years ago—it was either in the late twenties or early thirties—Herbert Hoover composed a "bill of rights" for boys which I give you today:

"1. Like everybody else, he has a right to the pursuit of happiness.

"2. He has the right to play that will stretch his imagination and prove his prowess and skill.

"3. He has a right to the constructive joy from adventure and thrills that are a part of an opening life.

"4. He has a right to affection and friendship.

"5. He has a right to the sense of security in belonging to some group.

"6. He has a right to health protections that will make him an inch taller than his dad.

"7. He has the right to education and training that amplifies his own natural bent and that will fit him into a job.

"8. He has a right to a chance in getting a job."

Mr. Hoover has commented that these are not all the "rights" of an American boy, but they are the ones which should be of deep concern to all.

The direction which individuals and nations have traveled has always been of tremendous concern to Mr. Hoover. The direction of the trail that he took through life has continued to keep him active and interested in public affairs through his boyhood days into the present. He was born August 10, 1874, in West Branch, and we now find him in his 86th year, still alert with the characteristics that took him to the White House, to head the Hoover Commission, and again in more recent years as Chairman of a Famine Emergency Committee to serve the food requirements in 38 countries around the globe.

I could do no greater service to you today in the dedication of this Herbert Hoover Trail than to close with the following words from an address prepared by Mr. Hoover in February of this year. He wisely advised America and I quote:

"In looking over the current scene in our national life, if we take a worm's-eye view of the crises and forces which surround us, we may worry that we are approaching the decline and fall of the greatest nation in history. If we take a bird's-eye view, we see the fundamental strength of the American people."

These words of admonition come from one who followed the trail with an aim so high and so clear, with the spirit of the out-of-doors filling his being, that his usefulness to mankind will continue to reverberate for years to come.

Learning from the life and work of men like Herbert Hoover and the training and experiences that shaped their destinies can be very important in retaining and promoting those ideals that made and can keep us the great nation that we are.

Results of Poll on President and Issues in Third Congressional District of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, in April I mailed questionnaires to some 160,000 registered voters in the Third Congressional District of Indiana, asking my constituents to register their opinions on major issues facing this Congress and also requesting them to indicate their preference for President of the United States. More than one of every eight persons receiving the poll responded.

Because the Third District of Indiana is considered a representative cross-section of public opinion, I believe the tabulation of the 23,485 replies may be of interest to my colleagues.

POLL PREDICTS ACTUAL PRIMARY VOTE WITHIN 1 PERCENT

I point to the fact that the poll, which was taken before the May 3 presidential preference primary in Indiana, predicted within 1 percent the actual Democratic and Republican Party votes in the Third District.

The poll showed 55 percent of the voters indicating a preference for President favoring Democratic candidates while 45 percent favored Republican candidates. The actual primary vote in the district on May 3 in the presidential race was 56 percent Democratic and 44 percent Republican.

The apparent accuracy of the poll's presidential results strongly suggests that the answers to questions on issues should provide a fair and reliable measurement of public opinion in my district.

SUMMARY OF SOME RESULTS ON MAJOR ISSUES

Mr. Speaker, let me summarize some of the more interesting results of the poll. Substantial voter approval was given to such programs as health insurance for the elderly, Federal support of education, loans and grants to depressed areas, and amendments to the minimum wage law.

Nearly two-thirds of all voters were for using Federal funds for classroom construction. Democrats favored such aid by a margin of 5 to 1, Republicans by 5 to 4, and independents by 5 to 3; 53 percent of all voters approved the use of Federal help to improve teachers' salaries as well.

Voters strongly supported—by 2 to 1—a Federal program of health insurance for social security beneficiaries—70 percent approved an increase in the minimum wage from \$1 to \$1.25 an hour as well as extension of coverage to more workers.

Opinions were most divided on the issues of agricultural policy and the missile gap. Nearly one-third of the voters expressed "no answer" on the complex issue of farm policy. A slim majority of

51 percent felt the United States was keeping up with Russian space and missile developments.

Because voters were asked to indicate their party preference, the following tables of the results of the poll are di-

vided into these categories: Democratic, Republican, independent, and total of all replies.

TABLE 1

Questions	Democratic			Republican			Independent			Total of all replies (23,485) and percentages					
	Yes	No	No answer	Yes	No	No answer	Yes	No	No answer	Yes	Percent	No	Percent	No answer	Percent
1. Do you favor legislation to guarantee all Americans, regardless of race or color, the right to vote in State and Federal elections?	8,699	445	199	5,233	278	117	7,754	492	268	21,686	92	1,215	5	584	3
2. Do you favor reducing the national debt in preference to cutting taxes if the budget shows a surplus?	5,681	3,243	419	4,317	1,112	199	6,036	2,056	422	16,034	68	6,411	27	1,040	5
3. Do you favor an agricultural program providing:															
A. Price supports and limitations on production?	3,750	2,889	2,704	1,141	2,595	1,892	2,003	3,647	2,864	6,894	29	9,131	39	7,460	32
B. No supports and unlimited production?	4,353	1,955	3,035	3,645	824	1,159	5,151	1,245	2,118	13,149	56	4,024	17	6,312	27
4. Do you favor providing health and hospitalization insurance to social security beneficiaries?	7,507	1,702	234	2,564	2,852	212	4,841	3,325	348	14,912	63	7,879	33	794	4
5. Do you feel confident that the United States is keeping up with Russian space, missile, and other defense developments?	3,843	4,779	721	3,658	1,451	519	4,596	2,885	1,033	12,097	51	9,115	39	2,273	10
6. Provided there is a guarantee against Federal control, do you favor Federal support of State and local efforts to:															
A. Build more classrooms?	7,503	1,460	380	2,928	2,460	240	4,947	3,095	472	15,378	65	7,015	30	1,092	5
B. Improve teachers' salaries?	6,000	2,528	815	2,424	2,871	333	4,069	3,697	748	12,493	53	9,096	39	1,896	8
7. Do you favor a program of loans and grants to areas of serious and persistent unemployment?	6,862	1,912	569	2,299	2,846	483	4,302	3,375	837	13,463	57	8,133	35	1,889	8
8. Do you favor:															
A. Raising the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour?	7,801	1,145	397	3,126	2,171	331	5,451	2,515	548	16,378	70	5,831	25	1,276	5
B. Extending coverage of workers not now covered?	7,533	832	968	3,449	1,507	672	5,638	1,672	1,204	16,620	71	4,011	17	2,844	12
9. Do you believe we should seek an agreement with the Russians for nuclear disarmament with effective inspection?	7,203	1,660	480	4,333	1,030	265	6,357	1,589	568	17,893	76	4,279	18	1,313	6

TABLE 2.—Results of presidential preference poll

Candidates for President	Democrats	Republicans	Independents	Total	Percent
Humphrey.....	866	26	330	1,222	5
Johnson.....	331	35	173	539	2
Kennedy.....	4,572	232	1,488	6,292	27
Nixon.....	382	4,789	2,897	8,068	34
Rockefeller.....	165	276	416	857	4
Stevenson.....	1,201	29	431	1,561	7
Symington.....	1,003	19	302	1,324	6
No answer.....	823	222	2,477	3,522	15

Mr. Speaker, I attempted to present these questions on issues as fairly and objectively as possible, and I am glad to say that the reaction of my constituents as well as the press in this regard was excellent. I cite the following editorial which appeared in the LaPorte, Ind., Herald-Argus on May 20 as an example of the nonpartisan reception given the poll:

BRADEMAS' POLL

For several years Third District Congressmen have sent questionnaires to register voters of the district to try to get voter reaction on various issues. Returns on the recent one of Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS were the most extensive of all with 23,485 persons responding. This represented about one out of every eight to whom the questionnaire was sent.

Questionnaires which require straight yes or no answers are not wholly satisfactory. A weakness of any such query is also that so few voters out of the total electorate respond at all. Once a Congressman gets the returns, he will if he is honest with himself be somewhat in doubt as to just what he has on his hands.

However, just as only a relatively small percentage of the registered voters go to the polls in any election so the fact that only one of eight voters responded to the ques-

tionnaire does not mean it is valueless. That 34 percent of those responding indicated Nixon as their choice for President seemed to dampen the effectiveness of any charge that inasmuch as BRADEMAS is a Democrat only Democrats would respond to the queries.

If we can accurately assume that those replying constitute a cream of the crop of registered voters in that they give more attention to issues and tend to think them through and are willing to express themselves, then the results give some solid food for political thought.

Substantial majorities of those replying favor hospital and health insurance for social security beneficiaries, Federal aid for more school classrooms and improvement of teachers' salaries, legislation to guarantee full voting rights in Federal and State elections for all persons regardless of race or color, raising the minimum wage from \$1 to \$1.25 an hour, Federal loans and grants to areas of serious and persistent unemployment.

In short, those replying feel rather strongly that responsibilities of the Federal Government for the general welfare should be extended rather than cut back. Those replying in this Third District poll apparently don't take seriously the cries of those Hoosiers who would turn back the calendar to a rapidly receding States rights era.

The 185th Birthday of the U.S. Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, 185 years ago today, on June 14, 1775, the

Continental Congress established the U.S. Army to protect the freedom of our Nation. Since this date, the Army has met every test both in peace and in war. Today, in a world unsettled by tension due to threats of war and the ever-present specter of communism, our Army continues to provide for our freedom by guarding the frontiers of the free world.

To celebrate this occasion here in Washington, the Army is holding a special retreat review at Fort Myer, Va., at 5 p.m., to which the public is invited and a One-Army Birthday Ball at the Willard Hotel at 9 p.m.

I rise to extend congratulations to the U.S. Army on the occasion of their 185 years of faithful service to our Nation and to wish them well in all future undertakings.

The 185th Birthday of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, today June 14, 1960, marks the 185th anniversary of the establishment of the U.S. Army. The Continental Congress in 1775 established the U.S. Army and since that date the relationship between the Congress and the Army has been both close and cordial.

I wish to extend my heartiest congratulations to the Army on this anniversary

of their 185 years of faithful service to our great Nation. In the celebration of this event, marked in our Capitol by a retreat parade at historic Fort Myer this afternoon at 5 p.m. and at the one Army birthday ball this evening at the Willard Hotel, the best wishes of a grateful Nation should be extended to the dedicated men of the U.S. Army who are today continuing to provide for the security of our country by standing firm on the borders of freedom throughout the world.

Words To Tell Our Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague, the Honorable CATHERINE MAY, of the State of Washington, on May 28, 1960, delivered the commencement address to the graduating class of Marjorie Webster Junior College here in Washington, D.C. Because I feel that this address carries a message of great importance, not only to our youth, but to every American, under unanimous consent I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CAN YOU SELL THE TRUTH?

(Hon. CATHERINE MAY's commencement address given May 28, 1960, Marjorie Webster Junior College, Washington, D.C.)

Graduates, Dr. Webster, Dean Dumas, Mrs. Smart, parents and friends, I am honored to be the speaker for your 1960 commencement. This is an important day in the lives of you young women who are members of the graduating class, and I am proud to share it.

Traditionally, commencement speakers refer to this day as a milestone, a point of departure into a new life. Timeworn as the statement may be, it is very true—this day is the door into your world of tomorrow. And you will go by many different paths on to more education perhaps, many of you into careers, and most of you eventually into marriage and motherhood. Wherever you go, you will have an influence on those around you. You will become the center of an orbit where, very much like a pebble dropped into water which sends ever-widening circles onto the water's surface, your words and actions will reach out to touch the lives of others. And those lives, thereby, will be changed and influenced to some degree. Thus, I feel that my responsibility as your graduation day speaker, is to convey to you, if I can, in the next few minutes some special message, an idea, an inspiration that you may carry away with you today to be used as a contribution to your world of tomorrow.

Now, as members of the 1960 graduating class of the Marjorie Webster Junior College, already you have been well educated and trained to contribute much to the good of society here at home and abroad. To this special knowledge and preparation for your life ahead there is probably little I could add that would not be duplication. But, the other day as I sat in my office trying to string together some thoughts for this address to you, I recalled a meeting I attended in June of last year in London. In particular, I remembered with great clarity sitting in a room with 30 or 40 other people, men and women from many nations, and discussing

with them the youth of our countries. Because this was a meeting of the Atlantic Congress where 14 member nations of NATO—in other words, 14 of our free world countries—had sent over 600 citizen delegates to discuss, among other things, how well we were doing in the great war that rages, as you well know, out in that world you are about to enter—the war for men's minds. The war between two great ideologies—that of freedom, as exemplified by our American way of life versus the Communist doctrine. Now, as it happened, as a delegate to this Atlantic Congress from the United States, I was appointed to work on a subcommittee which had as its subject of study a most fascinating and frightening subject—Communist propaganda.

The work of our committee was based on some excellent depth studies that had been made on the extent of the Communist propaganda penetration into our free world countries, as well as our uncommitted countries. The studies presented proven and factual information on the thousands of agents and provocateurs who were trained and sent out by the Soviet into the world to spread Communist propaganda. It presented the actual figures of the millions of dollars being spent by the Soviet on their propaganda program alone. In addition, the material on the extent of the success of Communist propaganda penetration pointed up the fact that the youth of Russia were highly trained as Communist crusaders. A basic aim of Russian education for its youth is to instill in them a burning dedication to the Communist way of life. As a result, young men and women of Soviet countries are extremely effective, convincing and articulate in persuading youth of other nations to their beliefs.

It was then that we started this discussion which made such an impression on my memory. We had just agreed that we should be providing more opportunities for our citizens and our young people to go into uncommitted countries, to youth festivals, to cultural exchange meetings so they might tell the story of freedom.

Then, a delegate from Norway pointed out, "Ladies and gentlemen, I think we are agreed that the doctrine of a free world democracy has far more appeal for humanity than the Communist doctrine. And, I know the young people of my country are just as dedicated to their beliefs as are the young Communists. But, when it comes to telling and selling the great truth of a free way of life I don't think they are prepared. I am afraid a great many of them could not find the words.

"Tell me, is this true of the young people in your countries?"

A thoughtful silence followed his words. Then, one of the other delegates spoke up and said: "I am afraid it's quite true, not only of our youth, but of our adult citizens, too." And, one by one, all of us nodded in serious and even shocked agreement.

I think by now you young women know what message and what idea I wish to try and leave with you today. You see, this episode I have just related taught me first of all something about myself that I had not known. In evaluating how well we Americans do as ambassadors for our country and its free way of life, I was brought to the shocking realization that I myself was sadly lacking in effective word weapons to fight against the Communist ideology. To admit this on behalf of myself, as well as my fellow countrymen, was both puzzling and frightening. Puzzling, because I knew I was a patriotic American, a loyal American, with a deep and abiding love for my country. Frightening, because for many years now we have recognized that the great world struggle in which we are engaged is not alone one of military might. Beyond that, and even bigger than that, is the power of

an idea. And our opposition in this struggle is so well organized that they can train and support their spokesmen all over the world while they spread their Red death among the brain cells of humanity.

Since my return from the Atlantic congress, I have brought this subject up for discussion and study wherever I could. I have done this, because it seemed to me that I had no more significant contribution to make my country as a result of this free world meeting than to try and influence the young people of America to prepare themselves to sell the truth better than their elders have done.

Now, in bringing you a few thought-provoking ideas on how you might best do this:

In one group where we were discussing this, a friend of mine said: "We Americans are a funny lot. We have such great dedication to freedom, for others as well as ourselves, that we would fight for it and even die for it, but, by gum, we can't tell others what it is." Partly, I think we can agree, this is because we've had the plain good fortune to be born Americans. We have just always taken for granted the air of freedom which we breathe. There may have been a time when it was apathy, but, with two great world wars in the past, and with the present serious international tension, I cannot believe this is true now. I am certain that the generation which you young women represent does not look at what's going on in the Iron Curtain countries and say smugly, "This cannot happen here." I think that is perhaps why I have such high hopes that some of the ideas I leave with you will fall on fertile ground. With things as they are today, and as they have been since the day you were born, never has a generation in this country had a heavier burden of responsibility for learning to sell the truth laid upon them.

I can't give you any set words to use for expressing your beliefs, but I think maybe I can try to set up a few thinking guidelines for you.

First, I would sincerely hope that, in the busy lives that lie ahead of you, you would take some time out and search deeply into your hearts and minds for the answer to the question, What do I truly believe? Start with thinking of the basic beliefs which all of the free world countries engaged in this struggle against communism have in common—respect for the freedom of the individual, for the dignity of human nature, and a simple faith in God. Then, go behind these words in a search for their real meaning. Because, at this point, I would remind you of what I hope you already know—that the words of the Communist manifesto are beautiful words, too, apparently offering a wonderful life to those who would follow the creed, unless one went behind them and realized how the goals were to be accomplished.

So, having found the words for our basic beliefs, how then do we communicate to someone else what we in America mean by freedom and democracy, as opposed to what Communists mean by these words? We know that, in the hearts of all men, there is a universal and unquenchable longing for an atmosphere of freedom, for equality of opportunity, and the establishment of human dignity. How can we communicate the truth that these goals can be reached only through nontotalitarian government—with words that are the same words that the enemies of this way of life also use?

One night, when a group of us were discussing this problem, we came up with what I think is a pretty good idea. It was decided that we might start with the material approach to life, because something that everyone understands, regardless of race or language barriers, is hunger and cold and the desire for possessions and good things around us.

Frankly, I have never been exposed to a debate with a dedicated Communist over the virtues of a totalitarian form of government versus democracy, but, since the episode I related earlier in my talk to you, I've put myself through a lot of mental practice as to what I might say if such an occasion should arise. And, by the way, I recommend this mental exercise to you. It's not only challenging, but it's kind of fun.

But, to go back to preparing myself for this imaginary debate, one day I discovered a book that to me provides the perfect approach to telling our freedom story so that anyone can understand its basic truth. That book is called "The Mainspring of Human Progress," and it was written by Henry Grady Weaver. And, after reading it, I decided that I would present my argument as he does by posing a question to my imaginary opponent in this way: Why did men die of starvation for 6,000 years? And, why is it that we in America have never had a famine? For 60 known centuries, this planet we call earth has been inhabited by human beings not much different from ourselves. Their desire to live has been just as strong as ours. They have had at least as much physical strength as the average person of today, and among them have been men and women of great intelligence. But, down through the ages, most human beings have gone hungry, and many have always starved. The ancient Assyrians, Persians, Egyptians, and Greeks were intelligent people, but, in spite of their intelligence and their fertile lands, they were never able to get enough to eat. The Roman Empire collapsed in famine, the French were dying of hunger when Thomas Jefferson was President of the United States. As late as 1846, the Irish were starving to death, and, it is only within the last century that Western Europeans have had enough food to keep them alive. Even in this century, famines have killed multitudes, in China and India and Africa, and, as late as the 1930's thousands starved to death on the richest farmlands of the Soviet Union.

Down through the ages, countless millions, struggling unsuccessfully to keep bare life in wretched bodies, have died young in misery and squalor. Then, suddenly, in one spot on this planet, people eat so abundantly that the pangs of hunger are forgotten. Just think, for 6,000 years, men died of starvation. For 6,000 years, families lived in caves and floorless hovels without windows or chimneys. Then, within a few generations, we in America take floors and rugs and chairs and tables for granted, and regard electric lights, refrigerators, running water, and porcelain bathtubs as common necessities. For 6,000 years, men and women and children toiled desperately from dawn to dark to eke out their meager existence, and then, suddenly, in one place on earth, there is an abundance of such things as radios and TV sets, nylon hose and shower baths, and ice cream sodas and lipstick, and permanent waves. If you just think about it, it's almost incredible. In less than 100 years, Americans have conquered the darkness of night, from pine knots and candles to neon lights and fluorescent tubes, from fireplaces and stoves to automatic burners and air conditioners. We are conquering pain and disease and prolonging life. We've made stupendous attacks on space, from ox-carts to airplanes, and attacks on time, from pony express to telephone and television.

Now, it's true that many of these developments originated in other countries, but new ideas are of little value in raising standards of living unless and until something is done about them. The plain fact is that we in America have outdistanced the world in extending the benefits of inventions and discoveries to the vast majority of people in all walks of life. How did it happen? Well, perhaps the best way to find the an-

swer is to first rule out some factors that were not responsible. To say that it was because of our natural resources is hardly enough. The same rich resources were here when the mound builders held forth. Americans have had no monopoly on the metals. China, India, Russia, Africa all have great natural resources. Crude oil oozed from the earth in Baku 4,000 years ago. And, when Julius Caesar marched west into Gaul, Europe was a rich and virgin wilderness inhabited by a few roving savages, much as America was when the Pilgrim Fathers landed at Plymouth.

Is it because we work harder? Again, the answer is no, because in most countries people work much harder on the average than we do.

Can it be that we are people of inherent superiority? That sounds fine in after-dinner oratory, and goes over big at election time, but the argument is difficult to support. Our own ancestors, including the Anglo-Saxons, have starved right along with everyone else.

Can it be that we have more energy than any other peoples of the world? That's not the answer either, but it's getting pretty close. We are not endowed with any superior energy, mental or physical. But, it is a fact that we in the United States of America have made more effective use of our human energies than have any other people on the face of the globe anywhere or at any time. That's the answer, the real answer, the only answer.

Now, I would remind you that I'm saying all this in my mythical debate with a dedicated Communist in trying to explain what we mean in America by freedom. But, I think you gather that my real purpose is to offer you here today a starting place in your thinking and in your search for words to sell the truth.

Let me lead you down this path a little further, before I set you out on your own. Why does human energy work better here than anywhere else? Well, now the answer here is actually a study in physics with which I won't attempt to bore you. But, as simply as I can tell you, it is that the nature of human energy is controlled by yourself—nothing else can control it. The decision to use your energy to act or not act is always under your own control. And, this leads to two important points. One is that individual freedom is the natural heritage of each living person. And, second, freedom cannot be separated from responsibility. Your natural freedom—your control over your own life energy—was born in you along with life itself. It is a part of life itself. Any time you try to turn the control over to someone else, or any time anyone tries to take the control of your energy from you, something happens. It just can't be used effectively. For centuries, it's been tried. Every conceivable form of authority has been tried. Every conceivable form of unified control that takes this individual's use of his own energy away from him. But, each time, the experiment has failed, because only an individual human being can generate human energy, and only an individual human being can control the energy he generates.

The lack of understanding of these simple basic truths has for over 6,000 years stagnated human progress, kept the vast majority of people underfed, poorly clothed, and embroiled in wars and dying from famine and pestilence.

Don't take my word for it. Just take some time to study world history, going back to the pagan days, right up through all this whole history of all the dictator forms of government that rose and fell over a span of 6,000 years. And, then think of the history of your own Nation, which had its beginning just a little over 160 years ago. As John Gunther once said: "Ours is the only

country deliberately founded on a good idea."

I realize that, by this time in your education, you've had a pretty good grounding in American history. But, I promise you that, if you'll spend sometime going back over this rich and wonderful heritage of every American, you'll find it very exciting to find out how every move our Founding Fathers made was with this great idea in mind.

I think with this approach you'll see the history of your country with entirely different eyes. You'll realize, maybe for the first time, that the great fact of our history is that the American Revolution had no leader. To again quote from Mr. Weaver's book—"This fact is the hope of the world, because human freedom is a personal matter. Only the individual can protect human rights in the infinite complexity of men's relationships with each other. Nothing on earth is more valuable than the person who knows that all men are free and who accepts the responsibilities that go with freedom." As I said, the war for American independence was begun by an individual. He was asleep in bed when someone pounded on his door, and shouted in the night—"The Redcoats are coming." Well, what could he do? He was not a king or a governor. He was not rich or important. He was just one little man, unknown to anyone outside his neighborhood. Should he take the initiative? Such things usually cleared up. They always had. He must keep calm, consider the practical aspects, think of his family. Most men felt that way. They knew they could do nothing, and they had better sense than to try. And, that night in Lexington, many of them stayed in bed.

But, the unknown individual chose between submission that looked like safety, and rebellion that seemed utterly helpless. He had the courage of his convictions. He got up, put on his clothes, took his gun, and went out to meet the British troops. And, I like to think that he had a good wife there helping him put on his boots, as she said: "This is the right thing, and you must do it, John."

Not acting under orders, not being led, or wanting to be the leader, he stood on his own feet, a responsible, self-controlling person, and fired the shot heard round the world. And, the sound of that shot said that man is a free agent, that government is the servant, rather than the master. You know, it's men like this, and the thousands of others we find in the pages of history—the Washington and Lincoln and Jefferson and Lee—with whom you and I walk today, and we walk because of them carefully and proudly and also humbly, lest we fail them. And, because of this knowledge of our past, with a keen sense of the present and the future, we should each say to ourselves: "I am an American, and therefore, what I do, however small, is of importance."

It just seems to me that, once we grasp this root idea of our freedom, it becomes much easier to explain the tree of liberty that has grown from it.

For instance, words to explain to somebody about the form of government we set up to protect our idea of freedom. "Mainspring" says it this way: "America was to be set up as a republic, which means that the laws would be made and administered by representatives chosen directly or indirectly by the people to protect the interests of all the people. In the last analysis, any government, regardless of what it may be called, must be one man or a small group of men in power over many men. That being the case, how is it possible to transfer the power of the ruler to each man of the multitude? The answer is that it's not possible. The only solution lies in the direction of destroying power itself. The only way in which men can remain free and left in control of

their own individual energies is to cut the power of the government to its smallest degree."

The answer was simple, once it was found by our Founding Fathers. The head of a state is a human being, and a human being's thinking and deciding and acting and judging are inseparable. But, in this new American Republic, no top official would ever be permitted to act as a whole human being. The function of government would be divided into three parts:

1. The first part was to think and decide, and it would be called Congress.

2. The second part was to be responsible for getting action. It would be headed by the Chief Executive, the President.

3. And the third part was to serve as a judge or a referee, known as the Supreme Court.

Each of these three parts was to act as a check on the other two, and over the three was set a written statement of political principles, intended to be the strongest check on them all. There was to be government by law, with clearly defined rules of the game, rather than government by whim—the Constitution. The dangers of dictatorship must be avoided for all time to come. No

one person or small group of persons must ever be permitted to get too much power, and the minority, even down to the last individual citizen, must be protected against oppression by the majority, or by any organized pressure group.

And these objectives made it possible for our American Revolutionary leaders to draw the blueprints for this new and completely different political structure—our unique form of government, not only in the world of today, but in all time.

I said when I began this that all I would even try to do this afternoon was to offer you a few guidelines to follow on your search for words to sell the truth. My mission is accomplished if I start you on that exciting journey. It is accomplished if I have succeeded in getting you to look at your country and your birthright of freedom with new eyes—eyes that are both critical and understanding, because it is very important that you know that America is far from perfect.

And, I'm sure you do. Otherwise, we wouldn't get from your generation what our country must always have to keep progressing—ideas for a much better world. But, as you find our shortcomings, and think of plans to overcome them, be sure you always

ask to what degree are our shortcomings traceable to the form of political structure under which our country was founded—are they due to having drifted away from that concept, and how does our record compare with the records of countries which have tried to operate under the opposite philosophy?

Godspeed you, graduates of 1960, in your world of tomorrow. As students seeking more knowledge, as successful career girls, as happy wives and mothers, and as enthusiastic ambassadors for freedom. If you understand, and believe because you understand, you will find the words, and I guess I don't have to tell you how very important it is for you and the young people of all free world nations to find those words. Because it may well be that, in your generation, this great war for men's minds will be decided. Remember, your battleground is wherever you go. Use your voice, with your heart and beliefs behind it, among your fellow citizen and fellow workers, family and friends, and—very importantly—on the children you raise.

Thank you again for giving me the privilege of sharing this important day with you. You have my congratulations on winning your diplomas, and my very best wishes for your future.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 1960

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of our fathers, help us to be spiritually aware that when Thy voice was heard in ages past it did not cease to speak. Give us to know that for those who become quiet enough to listen, Thy word for this day resounds clear and sure above all the tumult and shouting of the confused babel of human folly.

In all our deliberations and appraisals of the affairs of state having to do with the tangled relationships of men, forbid that we should be insensitive to voices other than our own, and which make the world about us a whispering gallery telling of divine realities that surround us.

Give us open ears, alert and quick to hear each whisper of Thy word.

With hearts tuned to the unseen presence which enfolds our days with a love that never forgets, a light that never fails, and a life that never ends, may we face life's changing scenes with the radiant faith that—

This is my Father's world,
He shines in all that's fair.
In the rustling grass
I hear Him pass—
He speaks to me everywhere.

To that glad truth our hearts respond,
"Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth."
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 14, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 39) proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States to authorize Governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives, to abolish tax and property qualifications for electors in Federal elections, and to enfranchise the people of the District of Columbia, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 6597) to revise the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument and provide an entrance road or roads thereto, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 6597) to revise the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument and provide an entrance road or roads thereto, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Upon request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, early today we hope to complete action on the NATO joint resolution (S.J. Res. 170), on which we have a unanimous-consent agreement.

Then we expect to proceed to consider the Kennedy-Clark loyalty measure.

We have ready the Department of Defense appropriation bill. It is a very important measure, and we want to get to it as early as we can. We shall meet early and shall remain in session late, if necessary, in order to take action on that bill this week.

We also would like to proceed with consideration of the housing bill, and the postal and classified workers pay increase bill.

Then there is the proposed constitutional amendment relating to the District of Columbia, which will be before us.

So I should like to say to all Members of the Senate that I think they can count on long meetings for the remainder of this session and much hard work, including Saturday sessions and early morning meetings and late evening meetings, if necessary.